

Vol. 4.]

MAY, 1849.

[No. 7.]

THE

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM:

A MONTHLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO DOCTRINAL DISCUSSION, EXPERIMENTAL
AND PRACTICAL RELIGION, EDUCATION, BENEVO-
LENT ENTERPRISE, AND CHURCH POLITY.

'Search the Scriptures.—John v. 29.

Speaking the Truth in love.—Eph. iv. 15.

~~~~~  
REV. MILTON BIRD, EDITOR.  
~~~~~

LOUISVILLE, KY.

PUBLISHED BY M. BIRD.—N. H. WHITE, PRINTER, MARKET STREET.
1848-9.

TERMS, - - - ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

THE
HISTORICAL
RECORD
OF
THE
CITY
OF
BOSTON
FROM
1630
TO
1880
BY
JOHN
B. HENNINGSON
AND
JOHN
W. COOK
PUBLISHED BY THE
CITY OF BOSTON
1880

THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

VOL. 4.

MAY, 1849.

No. 7.

INTERMEDIAL SYSTEM IS RIGHT.

This system is not infrequently nick-named "Cumberlandism." Sincerely or otherwise, it is often said: "Well, I would like to know where to find this system." To such I would say, take passage in the safe car of the Bible, and you will soon arrive at Cumberlandtown, situated on the highway of truth between Calvinburg and Arminianville. The first inhabitants were drawn to the place by a conscientious regard for truth, and the operation of the same cause is rapidly increasing its population. It is a most pleasant, beautiful and safe town for a residence. It is between frigid and torrid zones; built upon a foundation more durable than granite; its sky is bright—no Italian sky so brilliant; its atmosphere is purer than the Alpine air; the chills and fevers of selfishness do not prevail there; neither the black tongue nor cholera of error.

The Intermedial System is incapable of being cooped in the exclusive limits of either the Calvinistic or Arminian system. I am persuaded that neither Calvinists nor Arminians are in exclusive possession of that system of divinity taught in the Holy Scriptures. The wheels in a complicated machine may move in opposite directions and accomplish its common design. Not so this system; for truth cannot be inconsistent with itself. I have not met with a decided Calvinist or Arminian who equally approved the whole of Scripture: the one approves what has a Calvinistic aspect; the other what seems to favor

his own particular views. Each so applies scripture, as to make scripture contradict itself. Not so the intermediate, who may expect a like measure of condemnation from the advocates of the opposite systems. In following the lively oracles of God, it is not his good fortune to escape either the selfish bitterness of prejudice or the force of the odium theologicum. The medium system is alternately approved by both Calvinists and Arminians, and condemned by both parties. They make no small effort to range the people under their distinctive banners, and convert the inspired writers into friends and partisans of their peculiar opinions. Still there is an intermedial stand-point to which they very nearly approximate. The pious of both parties, upon their knees before God in prayer, come to the medium ground; for then, the intelligent and devout Arminian acknowledges his entire dependence upon God as strongly as the most confirmed Calvinist; and the Calvinist owns his accountability to God, and his obligation to effort, in language as decisive as the most determined Arminian. Does not this indicate an intermedial basis or point of betweenity? Assuredly. The christian world is waking up to the fact. The truth is stirring its heart and moving the masses. The people will be right. Truth is their aim and they will have it. Let it be so. We believe it will be so. It cannot be otherwise. The career of its conquests over error advances nobly, grandly. God's finger is in it, and it will yet triumph.

When the time of truth's complete triumph over error arrives, Cumberland Presbyterians will be in the right position. Call it "Halfway house," "Middle System," "Calvinistic warp and Methodist filling," or any thing else, it is the system of the Scriptures. Distinctive Calvinism, and distinctive Arminianism are antagonistic extremes. The truth lies in neither, but in both; between them is the right position. We care not if the advocates of each extreme sneer at this proposition, and pronounce it weakness to believe any such thing; it does not make truth error, nor error truth. Their assertion, that there is no stand-point

between them, is not only without, but against proof. Neither party can see a needle's point between them for the foundation of an interjacent system. Why are both more intolerant to the idea of such a system, than each is toward the other, when it differs far less with both, than they do between themselves? As the party in the one extreme, so the party in the other, is quite certain that if its exclusive principles are not sound doctrine then those of the other must be. Why so? Has such a conclusion any foundation in common sense? By what operation of logic do they arrive at it? And beyond all doubt know that it is utterly impossible for any truth to lie between Calvinism and Arminianism? We venture to suggest the propriety of a revelation of the mysterious operation for the benefit of mankind. And until such revelation be made we see no more reason to believe it, than the often asserted infallibility of the absconding Pope's church; or the assumed power of the priesthood to transmute the wafer and the wine into the real-body and blood, soul and Divinity of the Son of God.

The day is not distant when party Calvinism will be negative; party Arminianism will be negative; when what is good and true in both will coalesce, and in the unspent energy of the intermedial system, will be the real brotherhood-disciples of truth, laboring in a common cause for the glory of God and the salvation of man. If Cumberland Presbyterians be only a preparatory agency to open, clear out, and make plain the upward pathway to the "Half-way house," or Intermedial basis; let God be praised and the friends of truth rejoice.

That he may fully refute the error of the Calvinist, the Arminian must occupy this ground. So the Calvinist, in order completely to expose the error of the Arminian. No Calvinist ever successfully refuted the errors of the Universalist without standing upon the intermedial basis. As in the debate between Rice and Pingree, so in every other between a Calvinist and a Universalist, there is a demonstration of the fact.

Calvinists, themselves know full well what is plain to

others, that the "doctrines of grace" as they are denominated—or the sterner features, as they are sometimes called, of Calvinistic theology—are not set forth and enforced, either in the pulpit or in private religious teaching or in the printed page or the columns of the newspaper, with the vigor of statement and clearness of elucidation which have marked an earlier period. The progress of the change among Calvinists, is indicated by the terms "*high*" Calvinist, "*moderate*" Calvinist, "*Sublapsarian*" and "*supra-Lapsarian*," "*Scholastic*" Calvinism and "*popular*" Calvinism. The inventive genius of Calvinistic divines, has been put to the rack in *popularizing* their theology. They have been constrained to strain off Augustinian theology from its mathematics. Will they cease to follow the distinctive views of Calvin, which were chiefly carried out at Geneva, the birthplace of that reformer, and adopt the intermedial and milder views of Melancthon, mainly used in the reform of the Anglican church? The wide spread influences operating at the core of the Calvinistic system, are working a result, what it will be to that system time will reveal. Already there are striking indications that its friends are disowning it, and adopting the intermediate system, and insisting that it is genuine old fashioned Calvinism! Of the variety of instances illustrative of what I mean, one or two may suffice. Seldom if ever does a Calvinistic divine now attempt to state what Calvinism is; while he asserts that it is not what others represent it; so one might readily conclude, that neither advocates nor opponents know what it is. In the Presbyterian of the West, an old school paper, Dr. Rice asserts that "the Calvinistic doctrine of Divine Decrees" does not "make God the author of sin by making him the *necessitating cause of sin*; that it neither destroys the free agency, nor the accountability of man. Such ideas he contends are all based upon a view of the doctrine not taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and not held by any Presbyterian. If so; then, have Presbyterians given up distinctive Calvinism, and embraced the *intermediate* system, Dr. Rice being judge.

Another old school paper, the Presbyterian Record, says, "the effect of the preaching of the gospel, is either to harden or soften the heart. It is either 'a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death.' Foreknowing the effect or result, it is as certain as if God were the direct author of it. Yet he cannot be the author of sin." * * *

"We are admonished, *not to grieve the Spirit of God*, for if we do, he will abandon us to our own chosen course. O if the spirit of God should depart from us, our hearts will naturally become hard and congealed, like the lakes of the North when the sun has left that hemisphere!" * * *. We congratulate the Record on its exit from Calvinburgh and arrival at Cumberland town. It is plain that not a few are satisfied with having any thing that is called Calvinism! Is any doctrine true that bears the name?—May one give the *ism* whatever shade of construction he pleases; and because he sticks the magical word *Calvinistic* thereto, is it straightway received as genuine truth, and he accounted, in his own estimation at least, a good Calvinist, a pious defender of the faith and an ardent lover of truth? The reader will judge whether this is a display of candor and intelligence, on the part of the soi distant defenders, interpreters and upholders of Calvinism at the time being.

Both Arminians and Calvinists often affect to have no conception of an intermedial ground; and express strong desire to know, where there is any place for it, and what it is. Then logically prove, beyond all controversy, that there is neither such place nor thing. The distinctive principles of our systems are antagonistic; ergo, if Arminian peculiarities are right, the Calvinistic are wrong; and vice versa, if Calvinistic peculiarities are right, the Arminian are wrong. It cannot be otherwise; for so it is decided by the unanimous vote of both parties, and no problem in Euclid admits of demonstration half so clear. We venture to suggest that such argumentation is utterly without foundation either in common sense or truth. We cannot assent to it. It is no difficult matter to ascertain whether the intermedial system has any existence except

in the imagination of its advocates. Any one, who would examine into this, must discover where, and in what lies the distinctive issue between Medium Theology and Calvinistic and Arminian; and in order to do this, he must first draw the distinctive lines between those two systems; and that he may do this with accuracy, he must apprehend the beginning point of difference between them. For a theological system consistent with itself not only contains all the essential elements of theology—it shows the different and true relations of those elements to each other, as the successive links forming an unbroken chain. It shows how one element produces another, and that again another, while a third follows as the effect of the second, a fourth as the effect of the third, and a fifth as the effect of the fourth, until, by the joint influence of the whole, the system is portrayed what the system is. And here, allow me to remark, that all this no preceding system of theology has done to a tithe of the same Scriptural simplicity and perfection, as the intermedial. If this is not yet sufficiently plain, it will be as we proceed.

There is yet a difference of judgment on the points under consideration. In order to their profitable investigation; to abate strife and suspicion; to remove mistakes on both sides, the controversy should be restored to its original ground, and viewed as confined to its first boundaries. There it will be seen where the ground of difference lies, and what are the extremes to which it is carried on both sides. The Calvinist pushes the action of Divine sovereignty so far as to make God an intelligent fate, without moral perfection; and man a machine. On the other hand, the Arminian pushes human agency to such an extent as to give man the control of his destiny independent of his Creator, and beyond his influence. This preponderancy, given to Divine agency by the one, and to human agency by the other, is the root of the difference between them. This fact stood forth in bold relief in the "five points" summed up in the Synod of Dort; 1, in regard to predestination or election; 2, the extent of redemption; 3, human depravity; 4, effectual calling; 5, the

final perseverance of the sanctified. As then, so now, the distinctive lines of difference between Calvinistic and Arminian theology, are to be traced in these points, arising one out of the other in their successive order. From the perseverance of the one, and the falling from grace of the other, we come step by step to the one great and leading point in which is concentrated the substance of the whole controversy; and upon its decision depends the settlement of each question of any real importance embraced in the subject. This point is the first of the five. Its prominent feature as regards the Calvinistic system, is the election of some to salvation, and reprobation of all others of mankind to misery, irrespectively to any agency of their own; and in respect to the Arminian system, it gives man the control of his destiny, irrespectively to God's agency; or to express the same thing differently, genuine Calvinism with its *unconditional decree*, virtually, sets aside the doctrine of a human will; and genuine Arminianism, with its ever conditional decree and never attained certainty, virtually, sets aside the idea of dependance on the Divine will. As the one makes God's will barren and unmeaning; so the other makes man's will a nullity. The distinctive leading element of one propagates the notion of an atheistical necessity; and that of the other, the notion of an atheistical uncertainty. Neither asserts truly and fully the government of the living God. The intermedial system alone does this. It avoids the extremes on each side, and embodies the truth contained in both. It includes dependance and certainty without the absolute decree of Calvinism; and the free, efficient agency of man without the human control and uncertainty of Arminianism. This is plain. It is easy of apprehension to any one who impartially examines the subject. It requires no special power of discrimination to discover the germ of the Calvinistic and Arminian systems, growing up and going to seed. This germ lies in displacing Divine and human agency. The Calvinist pushes the Divine too far; and the Arminian pushes the human too far; consequently there is disorder in the system of both. An

intermedial system is necessary to remove it. And the basis principle of this system, as the reader will readily discover, is placing the agency of God and the agency of man in their true relation or order. On no other principle can there be a harmonious interpretation of the Scriptures. No other can modify and develop a purely Scriptural system of Divinity.

Calvinistic divinity goes to seed in its doctrine of the absolute perseverance of the sanctified. Arminian divinity in its doctrine of the final apostacy of the sanctified. Medium divinity denies the falling from grace of the latter, and the necessitated perseverance of the former. It maintains the certain salvation, the free and certain perseverance of all who become elected according to the foreknowledge of God through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. Its doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints lies in their vital union to Christ by faith on their part, and by the renewing and sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit on God's part; not in an absolute predestination, irrespectively to any agency of their own; not in unconditional destiny, a decree of election inevitably securing their salvation, a decree in which character has no concern whatever.

Between Calvinistic and Arminian theology, we find the corner stone of Gospel truth; on it the medium system firmly rests. No resting place for it indeed! It is the decision of the common sense of the world, that the safe ground lies between extremes. What maxim more common in every day life, in philosophy, in science, in politics? Has it no application to theology? The reader will decide.

As from the opposite stand points of Calvinistic, and Arminian Divinity, proceed lines of distinction clearly marked; so from the distinctive stand point of Intermedial theology, threads of distinction extend plainly indicating that it is neither the one nor the other. The Calvinist's doctrine of perseverance is produced by his doctrine of effectual calling; this by his doctrine of human depravity; this by his doctrine of the extent of what Christ has done for man; this by his doctrine of predestination or election;

and this by his doctrine of Divine sovereignty, the starting point in his system.

The beginning point, in the Arminian's system, is his idea of human agency; this shapes his view of predestination or election; this his view of the nature and extent of the atonement; this his view of depravity; this his view of the agency of the Holy Spirit; and this his view of falling from grace; and so vice versa.

In the intermedial system the point of commencement is the concurrence of Divine and human agency, neither merged into the other. It therefore leaves Calvinistic fatality on one side, and Arminian uncertainty on the other, and gathers what truth there is in both sides. This system saves the believer by grace, and damns the unbeliever for his own guilt. It is no distorted system. It does not pervert the relation of Divine and human agency. I know of no other system which embraces the doctrine so plainly taught in God's word. It places the foundation of salvation in God's will; it makes the sinner's own agency the turning hinge of his damnation, not God's unwillingness to change his heart. The system makes the sinner feel that guilt lies at his own door, that his own agency is the producing cause of his perdition. It leads the saved to ascribe all the merit and glory of their salvation to Divine agency.

The sinner in perdition is not glorified, because he was not sanctified; not sanctified, because he was not born of the spirit of adoption; not regenerated, because he was not justified; not justified, because he did not believe; did not believe, because he would not. In his own agency he sees the procuring cause of his perdition. He rejected saving grace; guilt lies at his own door.

The saint is in heaven, because he was glorified; he is glorified, because sanctified; sanctified, because regenerated; regenerated, because adopted; adopted, because justified; justified, because he believed; believed, because he had testimony; had testimony, because the Holy Spirit gave it; the Holy Spirit gave it, because Christ died for him; Christ died for him, because God loved him. In

God he recognizes the agency by which he is saved, and to him ascribes all praise.

The Calvinistic, Arminian and Intermedial systems of Divinity have briefly passed under consideration. It is for the reader to form his judgment of their merits. That he may decide whether the first, or second is true, or both erroneous, and the third the true system, let him examine the starting point of each, and decide which is right, and which wrong. This will enable him to follow the vein of truth, and trace out the threads of error. In so doing, he will discover the fact, that the Medium system of theology is not gathered from the teachings of men; but from the Bible. It counteracts and corrects all extremes. In it there is nothing one sided; no malformation of doctrine; but a just proportion, a beautiful and true symetry. It bears the deep and distinct impress of the Bible. It sheds no newly discovered light upon the world, but the old light of the Bible. It was taught by the inspired teachers of theology. Among the reformers of the sixteenth century, it had an able and successful advocate in the mild and distinguished Melancthon. The good and great Baxter, Tillotson, Bishop Jebb, the learned Euler and numerous others, in their search for truth approximate the intermediate system. Here allow me to refer to the celebrated Simeon, alike distinguished for his piety and learning. In reference to the controversy between Calvinists and Arminians his sentiments are well known. His view of doctrinal preaching is plain. He speaks in language not to be misunderstood, as the reader will readily see in the subjoined quotations, from the preface to the *Horæ Homileticæ*. They are as given in the *Christian Observer*—1820.

“He has no doubt that there is a system in the Holy Scriptures, for truth cannot be inconsistent with itself; but he is persuaded that neither Calvinists nor Arminians are in exclusive possession of that system. He is disposed to think that the Scripture system, be it what it may, is of a broader and more comprehensive character than some very exact and dogmatical theologians are inclined to al-

low, and that, as wheels in a complicated machine may move in opposite directions and yet subserve a common end, so may truths apparently opposite be perfectly reconcilable with each other, and equally subserve the purposes of God in the accomplishment of man's salvation. This the author has attempted to explain more fully in the preface to his former work; to which he must refer the reader for a more complete exposition of his sentiments on this important subject. But he feels it impossible to repeat too often, or avow too distinctly, that it is an invariable rule with him to endeavor to give to every portion of the word of God its full and proper force without considering one moment what scheme it favors, or whose system it is likely to advance. Of this he is sure, that there is not a decided Calvinist or Arminian in the world, who equally approves of the whole of Scripture. He apprehends that there is not a determined votary of either system, who if he had been in the company of St. Paul, whilst he was writing his different Epistles, would not have recommended him to alter one or other of his expressions.

"But the author would not wish one of them altered; he finds as much satisfaction in one class of passages as in another; and employs the one, he believes, as often and as freely as the other. When the inspired writers speak in unqualified terms, he thinks himself at liberty to do the the same; judging that they needed no instruction from him how to propagate the truth. He is content to set as a learner at the feet of the holy apostles, and has no ambition to teach them how they ought to have spoken. And as both the strong Calvinists and Arminians approve of some parts of Scripture and not of others, such he expects will be the judgment of the partisans of these particular systems on his unworthy comments—the Calvinists approving what is written on passages which have a Calvinistic aspect, and the Arminians, of what is written on passages that favor their own particular views. In like manner, he has reason, he fears, to expect a measure of condemnation from the ad-

vocates of each system, when treating of the passages which they appear to him to wrest, each for the purpose of accommodating them to his own favorite opinions. He bitterly regrets that men will range themselves under human banners and leaders, and employ themselves in converting the inspired writers into friends and partisans of their peculiar principles. Into this fault he trusts he has not hitherto fallen; and he unfeignedly hopes and prays to be preserved from it in future. One thing he knows, that pious men, both of the Calvinistic and Arminian persuasion, approximate very nearly when they are upon their knees before God in prayer;—the devout Arminian then acknowledging his total dependence upon God as strongly as the most confirmed Calvinist; and the Calvinist acknowledging his responsibility to God and his obligation to exertion in terms as decisive as the most determined Arminian. And that which both these individuals are upon their knees, it is the wish of the writer to become in his writings. Hence it is that he expects to be alternately approved by both parties, and condemned by both. His only fear is, that each may be tempted to lay hold in his work only of those parts which oppose their favorite system, and represent them as containing the view of his sentiments. He well knows the force of prejudice and the bitterness of the odium theologicum; and he cannot hope to be so fortunate as to escape either. But, even if assailed on all sides, he shall have the satisfaction of reflecting that it has been his wish simply to follow the oracles of God, The Scriptures, and the church of England have been claimed by each of these two parties, as exclusively favoring their peculiar system; and if the same comprehensive and liberal character be found in his writings, he shall consider it, whatever may be the judgment of mere partisans, as no small presumption in his favor.

“There is another point also, in respect to which it has been his aim not to offend; and that is, in not so perverting the Scripture as to make it refer to Christ and his salvation, when no such subject appears to have been in the

contemplation of the inspired writer. He regrets to observe in some individuals, what he knows not how to designate by any more appropriate term than that (which, however, he uses with much hesitation,) of an ultra evangelical taste; which overlooks in many passages, the practical lessons which they intend to convey, and detects in them only the leading doctrines of the Gospel. This error he has labored earnestly to avoid, being well assured, that lessons of morality are in their place as useful and important as the doctrines of grace. In a word, it has been his endeavor faithfully to deliver in every instance, what he verily believes to be the mind of God in the passage immediately under consideration; and in the adoption of this principle of interpretation, he trusts for the approbation of all, who prefer the plain and obvious comments of sobriety to the far fetched suggestions of a licentious fancy."

We remark with the Observer, that we concur most heartily in the drift of these remarks; believing as we do, that systematizers are almost by profession perverters of scripture. We think also that Mr. Simeon deserves the best thanks of the moderate and modest part of the religious world, for having ventured thus boldly to declare his convictions on this irritable subject. There are divines who never willingly employ those passages of Scripture which speak of Christ's dying for the sins of the "whole world," without adding some restrictive epithet; there are others, who systematically urge us "to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling," laying a somewhat arch emphasis on the word own, and totally omitting the consolatory addition, that "it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure." The same persons, in speaking of those to whom "all things work together for good," and quoting St. Paul's own language on the subject, are afraid to say more than "to them who love God;" though the apostle adds, (what, however, they need not be afraid of, as it does not necessarily refer to the doctrine of personal election,) "to them who are the called according to his purpose."

Simeon was fully persuaded that neither Calvinists nor Arminians are in exclusive possession of the system of Divinity taught in the Holy Scriptures; such is our persuasion. We believe the Intermedial is that system. This is the system of Cumberland Presbyterians. We avoid both extremes, believing that the truth lies between them, and that the Divine counsel is what common sense gives in many other matters, *in medio tutissimus ibis*—on one side is *hyper-Calvinism*, on the other *rigid Arminianism*. Between them is the medium system. It is based in the word of God. The unsophisticated reason, and common sense impulse of mankind approve it as the true Scriptural system of Divinity. The fact is as evident, as that the reason and common sense of the American people recognize their government as the best among the nations—it being eclectic, a judicious combination of the best parts of the best governments that have preceded it. Believed or not, the period is fast rolling up in the world's history, when its modifying genius will have moulded every other form of government. So the modifying leaven of intermedial theology is working in other systems of theology.

Time has been when those wedded to the then existing forms government, confidently asserted there was no room between them for the existence of a purer and better government—such as our's is. It is not strange that religious prejudice and narrow-mindedness which adhere with tenacity to *distinctive Calvinism* and *exclusive Arminianism*, quite positively proclaim that there is no place between these theological systems, for a *medium* system, *divested* of the errors of each, and embodying the truth contained in both. But the fact is now admitted without hesitancy the world over, that the American government is the best, having its foundation in truth and justice. So will the fact yet be universally acknowledged over the religious world that the *intermedial* is the *true* system of theology—the Scriptural system of *sound doctrine* built upon the corner stone of truth.

EDITOR.

A BIRD'S EYE VIEW OF THE DISCUSSION.

THE REAL ISSUE SIMPLIFIED.

"The Banner of Peace" of Lebanon, Tenn., and the Presbyterian Record of Nashville have quite a protracted controversy on the question—"Did God eternally foreordain all things which he foreknew?" The latter affirming, the former denying. The controversy is mutually termed a discussion. There can be no objection to this. Since the term controversy excites the nerves of some people whose notion of piety inclines them to admit that all manner strange and conflicting opinions and doctrines are equal to one and the same thing—either truth or its equivalent: sooner than earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. Strange that the word pink should somehow produce the ordour of a skunk; and vice versa. But controversy to some may convey the idea of combat. If this were its meaning, I, too, would feel a strong aversion to it. What man, of right principle and correct feeling, is not opposed to fighting? Still it might even be right to obey the law of self-defence; the ultra doctrine of non-resistance to the contrary, notwithstanding. When the odium which, by some, is attached to controversy, may be so easily avoided by using another term, certainly no one is to blame for doing it. Who would not? We commend the Banner and Record for so doing.

We know not how it strikes others, but to us there is a degree of complexity in their statement of the question for discussion. "Eternally"—"foreordain"—"all things"—"foreknew" open, if I mistake not, at least four distinct points of debate in the proposition, (see it above given.) 1. Whether foreordination had any beginning? 2. Whether it extends to all things, or some only? 3. Whether foreordination and foreknowledge are identical? 4. If

not one and the same thing, then does one precede the other—does fore-knowledge lie at the foundation of fore-ordination, or vice versa? It may have been the intention to discuss each question. If so, would it not have been far better to have taken one at a time? The field for skirmishing would not have been so broad, and the debate confined to the real points of issue. If it were the intention of the debaters to examine the leading point of difference, the hinge of the controversy between Cumberland Presbyterians and Calvinists, then they should have stated it so distinctly as to leave no door open to spring any incidental question; then each could have held the other to the question controverted: on it they could have concentrated their attention as well as the attention of their readers: this would have enabled them, with far more ease and accuracy, to decide the question; for when truth is brought in contact with error, it is not difficult to discriminate between them.

As to every piece of music there is a key note which regulates all its parts. So to every controversy there is a leading point, the decision of which is the decision of the whole controversy, and until it is decided, nothing can be settled to purpose. At this point controversy starts and ends; else it is without form and void, having neither beginning nor ending. It is the point sincerely sought by him who conscientiously examines for truth; and uncandidly evaded by the determined partisan and willful supporter of error. In discussion, its clear and vigorous apprehension is essential to grapple with error, to elucidate and vindicate truth with energy and pungency of argument.

Arguments for, or against a doctrine, so nearly identical that they properly make but one, are based upon a single view; and to examine whether that view is right or wrong will enable one to arrive at the truth on the subject. If the Calvinistic doctrine of Divine decrees does not destroy man's accountability; it does not destroy man's free agency: if it does not destroy man's free agency, it does not make God the author of sin by making

him the *necessitating cause* of sin. But if it makes him the necessitating cause of sin, it makes him the author of sin; destroys man's free agency, and destroys man's accountability. This being the case, the particular point that needs to be argued is, does the doctrine of Calvinistic decrees or foreordination make God the necessitating cause of sin? Or otherwise, is whatever comes to pass an effect produced by God's agency? To me it is plain that this is the real or main issue between the Old School Record and the Cumberland Presbyterian Banner of Peace, divested of the mist of words.

Is such an issue based upon the doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and held by Old School Presbyterians? The Record fears to deny, he is reluctant to affirm. When the Banner argues to prove the fact, the Record attempts to shuffle from the point of discussion, and pronounces the whole of his arguments, nothing more nor less than an entire misrepresentation of the doctrine held by Calvinistic Presbyterians. The Banner pleads innocence, and says the Record is justly chargeable with the guilt attributed to his neighbor. What does the Record mean to affirm? What can he affirm, and maintain the doctrine in his creed? Nothing as I conceive but the issue stated above. Let common sense and honesty decide. In my judgment, to state such issue is to expose and refute it, in the view of all reasonable creatures on earth, in heaven, or hell. To affirm it strikes its advocate dumb. The Record is apprehensive it would stullify him. He would, therefore, so employ the terms "first cause," "second cause," as to create a mist in which, by a kind of metaphysical hocus pocus, he can do it, and not do it at the same time; and, ergo, hold himself not accountable for the one nor the other; while he avails himself of each alternately as circumstances may seem to require. And so, in imitation of the priests of the church of Rome, in their tricks of transubstantiation, he would slip upon his readers error for truth. By his tergiversations and special pleadings, to make the

worse appear the better cause, the Record sometimes rather exhausts the patience of the Banner, and he begins to talk to him somewhat after the style of the old woman skinning the eel: "You varmint, why don't you hold still till I skin you?" The Record retorts: he does not like the operation; and would much rather skin than be skinned. Notwithstanding both avowed their purpose to treat each other with marked courtesy, a very pacific and kind spirit, and so give a model of controversy altogether worthy of imitation, yet the subject sometimes proves too irritable, and there appears to be a want of that gentlemanly and christian treatment which each claims to have exercised towards the other, and may have done it to some extent, but have failed to do it sufficiently to show that they are but men having passions like others. It is with the readers of the controversy to judge whether the Record has not more to answer for than his neighbor, on the score of discourtesy, personality, playing on words, and wandering from the real issue. Such as have examined know how the matter stands. If we mistake not, as is usual on such occasions, each prefers to be in the most favorable position before his readers. Neither would be viewed as assailant, but defendant. We forbear further observations at the time being. Already have we travelled beyond what we intended. As we took up our pen, it was our purpose simply to state, that we had commenced preparing for this number of the Medium a brief review of the doctrinal aspect of the controversy; but have to leave it unfinished, owing to the heavy drafts upon our time by attention to other duties crowding upon us. The review may be completed and given in a future number. EDITOR.

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY

Science, from faith and love apart,
Perverts the mind, and steels the heart;
Sense, Science, faith and love combined,
Redemption this of all mankind. [SELECTED.

FAULTS IN THE PULPIT.

BY D. LOWRY.

Every person has observed that *manner* has much to do with the effect produced in preaching. It therefore becomes the duty of ministers of the gospel not only to avoid actual faults in the sacred desk, but to aim at the highest degree of positive excellence as public speakers.

1. The first fault in the pulpit which I would notice is, *an affected solemnity of countenance*. You ought to feel solemn, for you have a solemn work before you; but never *seem* to feel more than you do feel in reality. If you do, it will be perceived at once by the more discerning portion of your hearers, and prove disgusting.

The affectation in question may be traced to various causes. The preacher perhaps has entered the pulpit without having cultivated those devotional feelings of heart in his closet, which it was his duty to do. To cover this omission, he puts on a "*long face*." Or, he may feel conscious of not having prepared the *matter* of his discourse as he should have done, and is therefore embarrassed in view of a probable failure. This feeling he also attempts to conceal by an *appearance* of solemnity.

While I would urge the necessity of shunning all affectation on entering the pulpit, still there is an easy, solemn dignity in the appearance of a preacher, when he comes before an audience, which is every way becoming, and which never fails to accompany a heart and head previously prepared in the closet and study-room. The looks, the attitude, the gesture all indicate that the man of God, when in the sacred desk, *is at home*. On beholding him rise, the people feel the solemnity of God's *house* and *worship* and *day*.

2. *Sameness in the tone of voice*, is another fault in the pulpit that calls for correction. The sentences are all ut-

tered with the voice rising and falling precisely at the same points; and of course the voice becomes monotonous. If this be your manner, you ought not to complain if your hearers go to sleep under your preaching, and leave the house of God unimpressed. I care not whether your delivery be slow or fast, low or loud, your audience will soon grow weary.

To correct this fault, I shall not trouble you with rhetorical rules; you may be familiar with all that have ever been written on the subject of managing the voice, and yet the evil remains. To remove it, you must study your sermons well before entering the pulpit. Having thought with proper emphasis, you cannot fail to speak with proper emphasis. The only secret of the whole matter is to give the natural expression of the sentiment, as is done in earnest conversation.

In efforts to correct this defect, you would do well to observe the best models of public speaking, whether at the bar, in the pulpit, or legislative hall. *Ape none*, but *improve by all*.

3. *Reading sermons* must be included in the faults of the pulpit. It destroys that easy action of the body and gesticulation which are inseparably connected with true eloquence. It also creates a suspicion in the minds of the hearers, that the sermon read may not be original. A very intelligent gentleman once observed to me, while walking from church where the discourse had been read, "that was a pretty good sermon, but I am not sure the preacher is the true author of it." It is a truth too, which is fully tested by experience, that those parts of a discourse in the general exert the most happy influence, which seem to be produced at the moment of delivery, without any appearance of previous preparation. If confined to the manuscript, the preacher is deprived of such advantage before his hearer. He must say it as it is written, and keep his eye upon his paper rather than upon his congregation.

4. *A want of interest*—in the preacher's own heart—in the truth delivered, is a fault which calls loudly for cor-

rection. To remedy this evil, preach the sermon to your own heart, in the closet, previous to its delivery in the pulpit. Spend the Sabbath morning, if possible, alone, and much of your time on your knees before God. I have often been astonished to see preachers spending the very last moments before entering the sacred desk with the social circle. The sermon soon told, however, upon the state of the heart. Christians often act without thought in claiming a preacher's time for conversation, that he ought to spend on his knees. The writer remembers well a severe trial he once had on this subject. He was from home—the hour of preaching was at hand—he had retired to his room for study and prayer—two old friends whom he had not seen for years knocked at the door—entrance was given, but his heart sunk—they saw it and soon retired.

CALVINISTS.

Who are Calvinists? The answer is, a plain one and readily given. They are the mere copyists of the distinctive opinions and reasonings of Calvin. Correct says common sense. EDITOR.

ARMINIANS.

Who are Arminians? The answer is, alike plain and easily given. They are the mere copyists of the distinctive opinions and reasonings of Arminians. Common sense says right, unquestionably so. EDITOR.

BETWEENITISTS OR INTERMEDIATES.

Who are they? The answer is those whose doctrines and trains of thought are moulded in the alembick of their own minds by mature and independent investigation of the Bible. They are neither mere copyists of John Calvin, of Geneva, nor James Arminius of Leyden; but the copyists of

Christ, the infallible teacher from heaven. Their doctrines thus derived are strictly orthodox.

BOTH FALLIBLE, AND YET ONE IS INFALLIBLE.

It is a common practice with Calvinists and Arminians to assert, that the *distinctive ism*, of the one or the other, is beyond all doubt infallible. In nothing are they more perfectly and unanimously agreed, than in the opinion, that there is not and cannot be any place for an inter-medial system. Of this, they appear to be as confident as that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners. Still they are as free to admit the fallibility of Calvin and Arminius, as they are to deny the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Pope. Now, Calvin of Geneva, and Arminius of Leyden, are each, either fallible or infallible, in their distinctive opinions: if either is infallible, then it is only necessary to ascertain which; will they settle the question among them? and then tell the world, why his claims to infallibility are better founded than the Pope's? Truth demands that it be done: if both are *fallible*, then it will relieve my mind and perhaps many others, if they will reveal the strange process by which one becomes *infallible*. Is it like that which creates infallibility in the Roman church? The Pope fallible; the general council fallible; but the Pope and council united infallible!! If so, is the logic of these distinctive isms, that of Romanism? Two fallibles make one infallible—Two cyphers make one unit!! How long will Arminians and Calvinists assert, two distinctive errors make one distinctive truth—two distinctive wrongs one positive right.

EDITOR.

REASON AND FAITH.

Men reason much, and reason much in vain,
As promised pleasure often ends in pain:
Reason is his, and only his who knows,
"Faith is not reason's labor, but repose."

[SELECTED.]

MACAULAY'S HISTORY.

As a writer and historian, Macaulay has obtained a world-wide popularity. As D'Aubigne's *History of the Reformation*, so Macaulay's *History of England* takes hold of a popular feeling, which at once gives it the wings of the four winds of heaven. But for the style in which they are written, taking hold of the ardent passion for the romantic and fictitious, we apprehend neither could have had such a rapid and extensive circulation. In that which commends them and gives them their unprecedented popularity, there lies, we fear, an influence producing an untold amount of mischief, going far to counteract the good they may accomplish; an influence which, with the corrupt and fiction literature of the day, is feeding and fanning the consuming flame of corruption and the withering fire storms of passion, which oftentimes roll through the chambers of a distempered heart, and concentrate in fierce and hot flames that sweep over nations, burning up every beautiful flower and green shrub. Moved by an honest conviction that such is the fact, that which in the view of others is a crowning excellence of Macaulay's *History*, strikes us as a sad defect, so far as we are capable of judging of it.

We cannot permit ourselves to doubt that it possesses unsurpassed if not unequalled traits of excellence; still we believe it has some defects, and that it would be more worthy of its great popularity if it had no tendency corresponding with the light and corrupt literature of the age—if it had less tendency to excite the lower faculties of the mind.

Man's depravity has produced a blight and perversion of his mental faculties, as well as an alienation of his affections and passions from their proper object. Since his apostasy from God, he is more influenced by passion than conscience—natural excitement than reason—hence

the romance, the tale of fiction, the polluting novel, the use of alcoholic drinks as a beverage, use of opium, tobacco, and other narcotics, the theatre, circus, &c.

Passion only, or natural excitement does not elevate, but debases man. It perverts the heart and darkens the intellect. That history best accomplishes the proper object of history which corrects the errors of the understanding and purifies the sensibilities by giving the moral an ascendancy over the animal, not by giving the latter the controlling power. Its style should be anything but stoic, anything but epicurean.

There are some features of Macaulay's History of England with which we suppose High Churchmen will not be vastly pleased; others, with which those who admire and sympathize with the Puritans, will be as little pleased. After speaking of the former, the New York Evangelist gives its view of the latter, in which we concur, and lay before our readers.

"Its tone of sentiment is not so noble as might have been expected from the son of Zachry Macaulay, in behalf of religion and liberty. Its descriptions are sometimes one-sided and extreme. Sometimes the faults of character are much concealed and palliated; sometimes almost only the faults are brought out and displayed, and sometimes the mere manners are dwelt upon as faults, while the sterling virtues are either unmentioned or undervalued.

There are one or two defects which we wish particularly to point out. First, the crude, imperfect, and in some respects unjust view, which the historian has taken of the character and doings of the Puritans. Here, indeed, the history is often almost a mere caricature, and that, too, mainly by sketching and satirizing points of manners, as if they were the essence of classes, and sometimes in a way quite beneath the acknowledged dignity of the subject. Macaulay dislikes very much the strictness of the Puritan Sabbath; but that is no just reason why he should set down to a false account the Puritan antipathy to the sav-

age sport of bear-baiting. He says: "The Puritans hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators." He then quotes in a note, an extract from a paper of the times, designed to confirm his views, but as it strikes us, directly contrary to them, because it shows what an outrage was committed in licensing that barbarous popular diversion on the Sabbath day, and how just cause the Puritans had for putting a stop to it. The note is as follows, from a paper of 1643: "Upon the queen's coming from Holland, she brought with her, besides a company of savage-like ruffians, a company of savage bears, to what purpose you may judge by the sequel. Those bears were left about Newark, *and were brought into country towns constantly on the Lord's day to be baited.* Such is the religion they would settle among us; and if any went about to hinder or to speak against their damnable profanations, they were presently noted as Round-heads and Puritans, and sure to be plundered for it. But some of Colonel Cromwell's forces, coming by accident into Uppingham town, in Rutland, on the Lord's day, found these bears playing there in the usual manner, and caused them to be seized upon, tied to a tree, and shot." This shooting of the bears, Macaulay adds, was by no means a solitary instance, and he really speaks of it as if it were a signal crime, and a piece of unpardonable cruelty, when, at the uttermost, it was but a sudden removal of the poor brute beasts from the continual cruelty of the savage people, and a removal also of one great cause of Sabbath profanation. But Macaulay has not a word to say against the profaning of the Sabbath in this outrageous manner, or against the cruel sport of bear-baiting; and he asserts that the Puritans hated the bear-baiting, because it gave pleasure to the spectators: and the Puritans hated pleasure, and desired to torment both the spectators and the bears! It is really ludicrous to meet such a passage as this in a serious history.

Of a similar character with this misrepresentation is Macaulay's apology (for we can call it nothing better,) for the infamous licentiousness and dissoluteness of the

court, and literature, and universal manners of the reign of Charles II. He says it was the natural and inevitable reaction against Puritan strictness! As if the reign of the saints for some ten or twelve years could have compelled the nobility, gentry and whole literature of the kingdom to steep themselves in hell! Verily it is attributing a most supernatural power either to religion or hypocrisy, take which you please, to say that a partial prevalence of it for a dozen years or so, wrought such indignation and hatred of goodness among the people, such a scorn of cant, that to revenge themselves, they plunged headlong into the depths of sensuality. Macaulay well knew that this unbounded dissoluteness in the court, and consequent corruption among the fashionable and reigning classes of the people, was prevailing before the reign of the saints, and the rule of hypocrisy. It seemed worse under Charles II. by contrast with the severe virtues and admirable morals of the time of Cromwell; but it was only the same entire profligacy that was beginning to prevail under James I. and that, even as early as 1600, was gradually infecting, or preparing to infect, all English literature. Does Mr. Macaulay suppose that if the Puritans had been dissolute, abandoned, swearing, theater-going cavaliers, Charles and his court and English literature would have been more saintly? It is monstrous to put such immoral sophisms into a sober history. It is exalting to a high place, a base, specious apology for vice.

But of a very like tone with this are some other things in this work, affording very curious revelations of the author's habits of opinion. For example, in speaking of the Anglican priesthood, he describes one section as composed in part of men, "whose address, politeness, and knowledge of the world qualified them to manage the consciences of the wealthy and noble." Address, politeness, and knowledge of the world may make a courtier, may prepare a statesman for the craft and cunning requisite for managing a difficult snag in politics; but we never yet learned from Paul that the main requisites for managing a conscience were address, politeness, and knowledge of

the world. It is also a new thing in *our* theology, that the consciences of the wealthy and the noble need managing in one way, and the consciences of the poor and common people in another; the first by address and politeness, the last by such a rude instrument as the gospel. The consciences of the wealthy and the noble must be delicately and skillfully managed; poor souls, it might distress and perplex them most uncourteously, to approach them with the plain foolishness of preaching. Such a conscience requires a great man to handle it; and there were among the Anglican priesthood those whose address, politeness, and knowledge of the world admirably fitted them for this office.

The fact is, as Macaulay frankly says, the attention of the English Church was occupied with other things than the work of admonishing her erring children. "Her whole soul was in the work of crushing the Puritans, and of teaching her disciples to give unto Cesar the things that were Cesar's. The clergy made war on schism with so much vigor, that they had little leisure to make war on vice. The ribaldry of Etheredge and Wycherley was, in the presence and under the special sanction of the head of the Church, publicly recited by female lips in female ears, while the author of the *Pilgrim's Progress* languished in a dungeon for the crime of proclaiming the gospel to the poor. It is an unquestionable and most instructive fact, that the years during which the political power of the Anglican hierarchy was in the zenith, were precisely the years, during which national virtue was at the lowest point."

Another defect we shall note, is one which we did by no means expect to find in this historian, namely, a defect of sympathy with the struggles of liberty, with patriotism maligned and persecuted. The whole history of the murder of those noble patriots, Russel and Algernon Sidney, and the whole character of those noble men, Macaulay passes over in two most meager, most unenthusiastic, most lifeless sentences. It was a grand theme, around which to have clustered some animating and consoling

truths, in a tyrannic, wicked period, some warnings to Royal evil-doers, and some meed of praise to those who do well. But the man who could devote whole pages to Charles' dissolute court and manners, in things not at all essential, except for variety in the picture, lets those crimes of Charles pass with very little stigma, and lets those great patriots pass with hardly a word in regard to their character and cause.

And again, the character of Charles II. is treated with a degree of lenity, which itself is really a suppression of truth. The historian is at pains to tell us again and again that Charles was eminently well bred, and repeats a most untimely dying joke of the monarch as a proof of "that exquisite urbanity" which marked always the gentleman. We may, indeed, be pointed to some pages where almost as black a character as ever sat upon a throne is delineated, and that character is Charles's; and still, in those very pages there is a want of hearty severity on the part of the writer, amounting almost to a sympathy with the vices of the man. Macaulay's severity upon persons who enforced the keeping of the Sabbath, and broke down the May-poles, and shut up the theaters, evidently comes from the heart; but in dealing with an unprincipled dissolute king like Charles II. he is very tender and respectful. The whole coloring of his character is rather to redeem his vices from indignation than to expose them to contempt. This is a great moral fault in the historian, beyond controversy. It is a radical fault in this first volume of Macaulay's history. The very crimes which are treated with scorn and severity in other men, are touched lightly in the character of Charles, though manifested in far more portentous malignity in him, both for the reality and the example.

It is quite curious to compare in these respects Macaulay's severity towards James, with his tenderness towards Charles, who was by far the more dissolute, and in some respects the viler of the two, though not so grievous a bigot, nor constitutionally so cruel. But it is hard to draw the line between the wickedness of an unprincipled

relinquishment of men and their interests to others' cruelties, and an application of cruelty by one's self. A despot of the first sort of wickedness may inflict evil on a wider scale, than a tyrant of the last. We think Macaulay's distribution of judgment between Charles and James amounts, in some cases, almost to a fraud on the part of the historian, though it may have been only the careless omission of dates, which are greatly wanting in the work.

For example: it is well known that Chief Justice Jeffreys, that unrivaled and inexpressible villain, was chosen and appointed by Charles to his great legal office, for Charles' own purposes. Jeffreys, says Macaulay, "made haste to sell his forehead of brass and his tongue of venom to the court. Chiffinch, who was accustomed to act as broker in infamous contracts of more than one kind, lent his aid. He had conducted many amorous, and many political intrigues, but he assuredly never rendered a more scandalous service to his masters, than when he introduced Jeffreys to Whitehall. The renegade soon found a patron in the obdurate and revengeful James, but was always regarded with scorn and disgust by Charles, whose faults, great as they were, had no affinity with insolence and cruelty. 'That man,' said the king, 'has no learning, no sense, no manners, and more impudence than ten carter street walkers.' Work was to be done, however, which could be trusted to no man who revered the law or was sensible of shame; and thus Jeffreys was made Chief Justice of the King's Bench.

Now this account is brought in by Macaulay under James' reign, and in such a manner that the reader, if not very watchful, would go on under the impression that this execrable wretch Jeffreys was appointed to his office and sustained in it by James, and not Charles; whereas it was Charles, whose faults the historian says had no affinity with insolence and cruelty, who advanced this demon of cruelty into his high office, for this very reason, that Charles had work to be done, which could be trusted to no man who revered law or was sensible of shame. And if Jeffreys had not been made Chief Justice under

Charles, he would never have had that office. Charles set the example to James of employing him, and by him Charles accomplished the murder of Algernon Sidney. Yet Charles is represented by the historian as abhorring him, while James is represented as his patron! Honor to whom honor is due. The infamous Jeffreys was Charles' chosen and appointed Chief Justice and tool, not that of James; he was James' instrument of cruelty only by succession from Charles.

BENEFITS OF MACHINERY FOR ALL CLASSES.

Fifty years ago wages were no better, in fact less than at the present day, and the comforts and luxuries of life far more difficult to obtain. Articles needed by the poor man, cost in those days of comparative freedom from machinery, from twice to three times as much as they do now, and often more; and you will find that the greatest reductions are made in those articles to which machinery has been most successfully applied. There is no article of luxury or comfort to which machinery has not been extensively and successfully applied, of which the poor man cannot get more for a day's labor, than he could before such applications of machinery. Salt is now less than one third, iron less than one half, shirting and calicoes, and cloth generally, from one half to one fourth.— Pins, needles, shoes, hats, everything in similar proportion.

Forty years ago such articles of use or ornaments as clocks, were scarcely known, and could be afforded by the rich only. Farmers' wagons were chiefly sleds; their houses, cabins; their chairs, stools and benches; bureaus, pins driven in the wall, or poles hung across, and their windows often an old sheet or blanket. Nails and glass cost money in those days, and labor commanded little!

Since machinery has been applied, better roads, turnpikes, rail roads, all of which are a species of machinery,

have been constructed. Steam has been made to propel the boat and the great ship, and to give power to the mill, to the jenny, and the loom. Production, in many articles, has been more than trebled, and every thing the laborer needs has fallen, while his wages have raised or remained stationary. The clock, which the farmer had not and could not afford, now adorns the mantel of his poorest tenant, and summons him to his meals.

There have been less improvements in agricultural implements, than in machinery for manufacturing purposes, but this is the age of improvement. Let machinery be applied to husbandry also. Let bread and meat be as cheap as clothing, and if the distribution is not as equal as it might be, let us rejoice that if the rich man has more, so also the poor man has much more.

The cottager has now, by the aid of machinery here, what great kings have not in Africa, and what the kings of England had not before the introduction of machinery. The great Alfred sat upon a three legged stool, while many an English or American tenant now reclines on a gilded sofa. If the poor of England and America are not so well off as they should be, machinery is not at fault. It is machinery that has saved them from much greater misery, and the reforms which they need are chiefly governmental and social.—*Scientific American*.

INTERESTING RELIC.

One of the students (in the university of Prague,) seeing I was a stranger, politely showed me into the library. It was crowded with busy, silent readers, and a librarian, with a bunch of keys and a black gown, beckoned me to explore with him its rich treasures. There was one of the first Bibles ever printed, and there were the celebrated theses of John Huss, in his own hand writing. But the most interesting relic of all was a manuscript Hussite liturgy, discovered, as the librarian told me, in destroying

one of their ancient places of worship. It was found to have been executed at the cost of the different trade companies of the city, and was beautifully illuminated with paintings, the subjects of which were taken mostly from the Bible and the life of Huss. One of the series of these illustrations was very remarkable. It consisted of three small pictures on the margin of the same page, representing the progress of the Reformation. The first represented Wickliffe, striking a spark with flint and steel; the second Huss, blowing a little kindling fire; and the third Luther, holding up a blazing torch. Beneath was a picture of Huss intrepidly looking up in the agonies of death amid the flames, and surrounded by fierce looking persecutors at constance.—*Dr. Carson's Loiterings in Europe.*

SELECT SENTENCES.

Quaint notions, philosophical speculations and strains of wit, if set in competition with the oracles of God, are but as many spider's webs, to catch flies, fitter for the taking of fancies, than the saving of souls.

Other books may render men learned unto ostentation; but the Bible only can make them really wise unto salvation.

The dust, or finery, about your Bibles, is a witness now, and will at the last day, be a witness of the enmity of your hearts against Christ as a prophet.

Do not teach the Bible, but let the Bible teach you.

For wolves to devour sheep, is no wonder; but for sheep to devour one another, is monstrous and astonishing.

Were saints their own carvers, they would soon cut their own fingers.

Strong affections make strong afflictions.

High professor, despise not weak saints. Thou mayest come to wish to be in the condition of the meanest of them.

God's gracious biddings are effectual enablings.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM: A MONTHLY JOURNAL,

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY REV. MILTON BIRD.

The Medium aims to promote theological truth, experimental and practical religion, and enterprise, and sound church polity. It shall, as its title imports, maintain principles of the "conservative" or "middle system," as embodied in Holy Scripture. Published monthly, in octavo form, each number containing thirty-two pages. Handsome cover, executed in a workmanlike manner, on good paper, with new index and title page will accompany the work.

E.—To subscribers ONE DOLLAR in advance for one year or twelve numbers, a volume of 364 pages.

Person who may obtain four subscribers, and forward us the amount, (\$4) free of charge shall be entitled to a fifth copy gratis.

Persons may remit us money, or send the names of new subscribers by mail at our expense and should invariably write the name to be credited, or that of the new subscriber, together with the post office, county and state, in a plain manner.

If a subscription is discontinued all arrearages must be paid; and any subscriber desiring to discontinue the work, will please do so by written communication, directly to the Editor, post paid or franked by a post master. ~~By~~ Sending back numbers or refusing them, is not such notice of discontinuance as the law requires. ~~By~~

Orders of business or remittance should be addressed only to the Editor, and all orders except such as contain money or new subscribers; otherwise they will not be acted on.

Receipts for the Medium.

Illness.—A. Stevenson, vols. 3 and 4, \$2 00.

Illness.—Rev. G. W. Edmundson, 4th vol. \$1 00.

Illness.—R. K. Gaston, 4th vol. \$1 00; Geo. Brown, 1 00; John Mosely, 1 00; G. A. Flower, 1 00.

Illness.—Dr. A. H. Champion, \$3 00; Rev. Johnson Dysart, 2 00; Seeholt, 4th vol. 100; John N. Hill, 1 00; Rev. Samuel Warham,

Illness.—Hiram Cordell, \$3 00.

Illness.—Rev. Neil Johnson, \$1 00.

Illness.—James A. Secor, \$1 00.

Illness.—John N. Vance, 4th vol. \$1 00; Wm. Perrin, 100.

Illness.—Thomas Pollock, \$100; Rev. J. H. D. Henderson, 1 00; Under Sprowles, 1 00.

Dr. J. B. Little
paid
Illness